arXiv:1404.4657v2 [math.DS] 14 Sep 2014

THE HAUSDORFF DIMENSION OF NON-UNIQUELY ERGODIC DIRECTIONS IN $\mathcal{H}(2)$ IS ALMOST EVERYWHERE 1/2

JAYADEV S. ATHREYA AND JON CHAIKA

Abstract. We show that for almost every (with respect to Masur-Veech measure) $\omega \in \mathcal{H}(2)$, the set of angles $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$ so that $e^{i\theta}\omega$ has non-uniquely ergodic vertical foliation has Hausdorff dimension (and codimension) 1/2.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
1.1. Outline of proof 3
2. Background material 4
2.1. Our spaces 4
2.2. Rauzy induction 5
3. Abstract Setup 7
4. The paths we take 9
4.1. Properties 10
4.2. What we will show 10
4.3. Angle bounds 10
4.4. Non-unique ergodicity 13
4.5. Number of described matrices 14
5. Verifying the assumptions of Proposition 3.1 15
6. Bounds for Hausdorff dimension 16
6.1. Technical Lemmas 16
6.2. Upper Bound 17
6.3. Corollaries 18
References 18

J.S.A. partially supported by NSF grant DMS 1069153, NSF grants DMS 1107452, 1107263, 1107367 "RNMS: GEometric structures And Representation varieties" (the GEAR Network), and NSF CAREER grant DMS 1351853.

J.C. partially supported by NSF grants DMS 1004372, 1300550.

1. Introduction

A genus g *translation surface* (X, ω) is a compact, genus g Riemann surface together with a holomorphic one-form ω. This gives a structure of a flat metric away from a finite number of singular points, as integrating the one-form ω gives charts (away from zeros of ω) to $\mathbb{C}$ where the transition functions between charts are translations. The zeros of ω are singular points of the metric, and have cone angles $2\pi(k+1)$ at a zero of order k. Translation surfaces inherit a straight line unit speed flow in each direction $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$ (corresponding to the foliation $\mathrm{Re}(e^{i\theta}\omega) = 0$). These flows preserve Lebesgue measure on the surface. A key result on the ergodic properties of these flows was proved by Kerckhoff, Masur and Smillie [5]:

Theorem. [5, Theorem 2] For every translation surface the flow in almost every direction is uniquely ergodic with respect to Lebesgue measure.

Moduli spaces of translation surfaces are stratified by their genus g and the combinatorics of their singularities. We say a singularity has order k if the angle is $2\pi(k+1)$. The Gauss-Bonnet theorem implies that the sum of orders of singularities on a genus g surface is $2g-2$. Given a partition $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m$, $\sum \alpha_i = 2g-2$, we define the stratum $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(\alpha)$ to be the moduli space of (unit-area) translation surfaces with singularity pattern α. On each stratum $\mathcal{H}$, there are coordinate charts to an appropriate Euclidean space, and pulling back Lebesgue measure yields a natural measure μ_{MV}, known as *Masur-Veech* measure. Similarly, pulling back Euclidean distance yields a (local) metric on flat surfaces in a given stratum. For each translation surface, there is a countable set of directions where the flow is not minimal (that is, there are non-dense infinite trajectories). Moreover, by a theorem of Masur-Smillie [10] for almost every translation surface, there is an uncountable set of non-uniquely ergodic directions. Given a translation surface ω, let

$$\mathrm{NUE}(\omega) := \{\theta : \text{ vertical flow on } e^{i\theta}\omega \text{ is non-uniquely ergodic}\}.$$

Theorem. [10, Main Theorem] In every stratum of translation surfaces $\mathcal{H}(\alpha)$ of surfaces of genus at least 2 there is a constant $c = c(\alpha) > 0$ such that for μ_{MV}-almost every flat surface $\omega \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\mathrm{Hdim}(\mathrm{NUE}(\omega)) = c.$$

We call the constant $c = c(\alpha)$ the *Masur-Smillie constant* of the stratum of $\mathcal{H}(\alpha)$. Masur [9] showed that $c(\alpha) \leq 1/2$ for all α. The main result of this paper is that for $\mathcal{H}(2)$, the Masur-Smillie constant is $1/2$.

Theorem 1.1. *For μ_{MV}-almost every $\omega \in \mathcal{H}(2)$,*

$$\mathrm{Hdim}(\mathrm{NUE}(\omega)) = \frac{1}{2} = 1 - \frac{1}{2}.$$

By our methods we also obtain the Hausdorff dimension of the set of translation surfaces in $\mathcal{H}(2)$ where the vertical flow is non-uniquely ergodic. The real dimension of $\mathcal{H}(2)$ is 7, and we have:

Theorem 1.2.

$$\mathrm{Hdim}\left(\{\omega \in \mathcal{H}(2) : \textit{ vertical flow on } \omega \textit{ is non-uniquely ergodic}\}\right) = \frac{13}{2} = 7 - \frac{1}{2}.$$

Remark 1.3. This is the first time the Masur-Smillie constant for a stratum has been identified. Earlier, Cheung, Hubert, and Masur [2] identified the Hausdorff dimension of non-uniquely ergodic directions for the historically important example of two symmetric

tori glued along a slit. The Hausdorff dimension is either $\frac{1}{2}$ or 0 and they gave an explicit description of these two cases based on the diophantine properties of the length of the slit. Earlier, Cheung [1] had found an example of two symmetric tori glued along a slit where the set of non-uniquely ergodic directions has Hausdorff dimension $\frac{1}{2}$. In the paper's appendix, Boshernitzan showed a residual set of these examples have that the set of non-uniquely ergodic directions has Hausdorff dimension 0. All of these results deal with a measure zero subset of the stratum $\mathcal{H}(1,1)$.

Prior to the paper [5], Masur [8] and Veech [17] independently showed that for almost every flat surface the flow in almost every direction was uniquely ergodic with respect to Lebesgue measure. Constructions of non-uniquely ergodic IETs are due to Sataev [14], Keane [4] and Keynes-Newton [6], and, anachronistically, Veech [15].

To prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, we establish a related theorem for interval exchange transformations (IETs) (see Section 2 for the definition of IETs). Given a permutation $\pi \in S_m$ on m-letters, we parameterize the set of IETs which have π as a permutation by the unit simplex

$$\Delta_m := \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^m : \sum_{i=1}^{m} \lambda_i = 1 \right\}.$$

We denote the IET with length vector λ and permutation π by $T_{\lambda,\pi}$. Note that the real dimension of Δ_m is $m-1$.

Theorem 1.4. *The Hausdorff dimension of the set* NUE(4321) *of non-uniquely ergodic 4-IETs of* $[0,1)$ *with permutation* $\pi_0 = (4321)$ *is* $\frac{5}{2}$. *That is*

$$\text{Hdim}(\text{NUE}(4321)) = \text{Hdim}\left(\{\lambda \in \Delta_4 : T_{\lambda,\pi_0} \text{ is non-uniquely ergodic }\}\right) = \frac{5}{2} = 3 - \frac{1}{2}.$$

Remark 1.5. Theorems 1.1, 1.2 and 1.4 all state that the *Hausdorff codimension* of non-uniquely ergodic objects is $\frac{1}{2}$.

By combining work of Masur [9], Minsky-Weiss [13] and a basic result in metric geometry [11] we obtain the following general result:

Theorem 1.6. *The set of non-uniquely ergodic n-IETs has Hausdorff codimension at least* $\frac{1}{2}$. *The set of flat surfaces in any (connected component of any) stratum whose vertical flow is not uniquely ergodic has Hausdorff codimension at least* $\frac{1}{2}$.

1.1. **Outline of proof.** Masur's theorem [9], together with standard results in metric geometry, provides the upper bound. For the lower bound, we generate specific paths in Rauzy induction (see Section 2.2) that by a criterion of Veech [16] (Lemma 4.1 in this paper) give minimal and non-uniquely ergodic IETs. The cylinder sets of these paths have nice geometric properties (Section 4.1). This allows us to construct a measure carried on these non-uniquely ergodic IETs that by Frostman's Lemma shows they have Hasudorff dimension $\frac{5}{2}$ (Sections 3 and 6). To prove Theorem 1.2 we appeal to a standard decomposition of the stratum into stable and unstable foliations. The property that the vertical flow is non-uniquely ergodic depends only on the unstable coordinate and reduces the problem to IETs. To prove Theorem 1.1 we use a result of Minsky and Weiss [13] that varying directions on a fixed flat surface gives lines in IET space (technically, they and also this paper consider the horocycle through a translation surface). Having enough lines implies by standard results in metric geometry that many of the lines intersect non-uniquely ergodic IETs in Hausdorff dimension $\frac{1}{2}$. This establishes Theorem 1.1 for a positive measure set of flat surfaces. There

is an $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ action on each stratum which is ergodic (on connected components of strata). The Hausdorff dimension of non-uniquely ergodic directions is invariant under this action. The ergodicity of the $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ action lets us go from positive to full measure and proves Theorem 1.1.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank Michael Boshernitzan, Yitwah Cheung, Marianna Csornyei, Howard Masur, and Jeremy Tyson for useful discussions. J.S.A. would like to thank the University of Chicago and Yale University for their hospitality, and J.C. would like to thank the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign and Yale University for their hospitality. We would like to thank Mathematisches Forschungsinstitut Oberwolfach (MFO) and the organizers of the workshop "Flat Surfaces, and Dynamics on Moduli Spaces", March 2014. We would like to thank the anonymous referee for their patient and careful reading which has vastly improved the clarity of the paper.

2. Background material

2.1. **Our spaces.** This section recalls standard material which is treated in, for example, Zorich's survey [19]. A translation surface can be given by a union of polygons $P_1 \cup \cdots \cup P_n$ where each $P_i \subset \mathbb{C}$, and that each side of each P_i is glued to exactly one other (parallel) side by a translation, and the total resulting angle at each vertex is an integer multiple of 2π. Translation surfaces can be organized by the number and order of these singularities, that is by integer partitions α of $2g-2$, where g is the genus of the surface, yielding *strata* $\mathcal{H}(\alpha)$. Since translations are holomorphic, and preserve the one-form dz, we obtain a complex structure and a holomorphic differential ω on the identified surface, which away from zeros is locally dz. The zeroes of the differential will be at the identified vertices with total angle greater than 2π, and the order of the zero is equal to the excess angle, that is $\omega = z^k dz$ in a neighborhood of a point with total angle $2\pi(k+1)$. This paper concerns translation surfaces in the stratum $\mathcal{H}(2)$, that is, genus 2 surfaces with one singularity with angle 6π. Kontsevich-Zorich [7] classified the connected components of strata. There are at most three and in our case there is only one, that is, $\mathcal{H}(2)$ is connected.

By varying the sides of the polygons P_i one changes the flat surface. This gives *local coordinates* on strata (modeled on relative cohomology of the surface with respect to the singularities) which give the *Masur-Veech* measure μ_{MV}. $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ acts on strata via linear action on the polygons P_i. Masur [8] and Veech [17] showed that this action is ergodic with respect to μ_{MV} on connected components of the stratum. On any translation surface, we have the straight line flow given by flow in the vertical direction in $\mathbb{C}$, and the flow in direction θ, which is the vertical flow on the surface $e^{i\theta}\omega$. For any translation surface, the first return map of the flow in a fixed direction to a transverse interval gives a special map of the interval, known as an *interval exchange transformation*.

Definition 2.1. *Given $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_d)$ where $\lambda_i > 0$, we obtain d sub-intervals of the interval $[0, \sum_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_i)$:*

$$I_1 = [0, \lambda_1), I_2 = [\lambda_1, \lambda_1 + \lambda_2), \ldots, I_d = [\lambda_1 + \ldots \lambda_{d-1}, \lambda_1 + \ldots + \lambda_{d-1} + \lambda_d).$$

*Given a permutation π on the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, d\}$, we obtain a d-*Interval Exchange Transformation *(IET) $T\colon [0, \sum_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_i) \to [0, \sum_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_i)$ which exchanges the intervals I_i according to π. That*

is, if $x \in I_j$ *then*

$$T(x) = x - \sum_{k<j} \lambda_k + \sum_{\pi(k')<\pi(j)} \lambda_{k'}.$$

For a small enough neighborhood in the space of translation surfaces U, one can locally fix a transversal where the IET has $2g+k-1$ intervals, where g is the genus and k is the number of singularities of the translation surface. This provides a map $\mathcal{T} : U \to \mathbb{R}_+^{2g+k-1}$. This is a (locally) Lipshcitz map from U with the metric given by coordinates to $\mathbb{R}_+^{2g+k-1}$ with the Euclidean metric. In fact, it is still locally Lipschitz if we compose it with the natural map $\lambda \mapsto \frac{\lambda}{|\lambda|}$, (where $|\lambda| = \sum \lambda_i$) to obtain a map from U to the simplex $\Delta_{2g+k-1} := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^{2g+k-1} : \sum \lambda_i = 1\}$.

2.2. **Rauzy induction.** The proof of our main result (and indeed many results on ergodicity of IETs) uses in a crucial fashion the Rauzy induction renormalization procedures for IETs, involving induced maps on certain subintervals, and closely related to Teichmüller geodesic flow. Our treatment of Rauzy induction will be the same as in [17, Section 7]. For further details of the procedure (and much more on IETs) we refer the interested reader, to, e.g. [18], for an excellent survey.

FIGURE 1. The Rauzy Class of (4321). Dashed arrows represent 'A'-moves, and solid 'B'-moves .



The Rauzy induction map R is defined for all but a codimension 1 set of IETs and associates to an interval exchange map $T = T_{\lambda,\pi}$, (now we restrict to $\lambda \in \Delta_m$, the unit simplex in $\mathbb{R}_+^m$, $\pi \in S_m$) a new interval exchange map $R(T) = T_{\lambda',\pi'}$, by considering the induced map of T on the subinterval $[0, 1 - \min(\lambda_m, \lambda_{\pi^{-1}m}))$, and renormalizing the lengths so $R(T)$ is again a map of $[0, 1)$. λ' is related to λ via a projective linear transformation defined below. Rauzy induction is only defined if $\lambda_m \neq \lambda_{\pi^{-1}m}$. The *Rauzy class* $\mathcal{R}$ of a permutation π is the subset of S_m that contains all the forward images of π under Rauzy induction. The permutations in the Rauzy class form the vertices of the *Rauzy graph*, a directed graph with two edges emanating from each permutation $\sigma \in \mathcal{R}$, corresponding to the permutations obtained by inducing on $[0, 1 - \lambda_m)$ and $[0, 1 - \lambda_{\sigma^{-1}m})$ respectively.

If $\lambda_m = \min(\lambda_m, \lambda_{\pi^{-1}m})$ we say the first step in Rauzy induction is A. In this case the permutation of $R(T)$ is given by

$$\pi'(j) = \begin{cases} \pi(j) & j \leq \pi^{-1}(d) \\ \pi(d) & j = \pi^{-1}(d) + 1 \\ \pi(j-1) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

FIGURE 2. Rauzy matrices for the edges in the Rauzy graph of (4321). We divide into left and right sides and note the symmetries.

Right Side		Left Side	
Edge	Matrix	Edge	Matrix
$(4321) \to (4132)$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$(4321) \to (2431)$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$
$(4132) \to (4213)$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$(2431) \to (3241)$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$
$(4213) \to (4321)$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$(3241) \to (4321)$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$
$(4132) \to (3142)$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$(2431) \to (2413)$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$
$(3142) \to (3142)$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$(2413) \to (2413)$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$
$(3142) \to (4132)$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$(2413) \to (2431)$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$
$(4213) \to (4213)$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$(3241) \to (3241)$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$

We record the action of Rauzy induction by the elementary matrix $M(T,1)$ where

$$M(T,1)[ij] = \begin{cases} \delta_{i,j} & j \leq \pi^{-1}(d) \\ \delta_{i,j-1} & j > \pi^{-1}(d) \text{ and } i \neq d \\ \delta_{\pi^{-1}(d)+1,j} & i = d \end{cases}.$$

If $\lambda_{\pi^{-1}m} = \min(\lambda_m, \lambda_{\pi^{-1}m})$we say the first step in Rauzy induction is B. In this case the permutation of $R(T)$ is given by

$$\pi'(j) = \begin{cases} \pi(j) & \pi(j) \leq \pi(d) \\ \pi(j)+1 & \pi(d) < \pi(j) < d \\ \pi(d)+1 & \pi(j) = d \end{cases}.$$

We keep track of what has happened under Rauzy induction by a matrix

$$M(T,1)[ij] = \begin{cases} 1 & i = d \text{ and } j = \pi^{-1}(d) \\ \delta_{i,j} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

We have

$$\lambda = \frac{M(T,1)\lambda'}{|M(T,1)\lambda'|}.$$

Here, $|\cdot|$ denotes the L_1 norm on $\mathbb{R}^d$. $M(T,1)$ depends on whether the step is A or B and the permutation π. We define the n^{th} matrix of Rauzy induction by

$$M(T,n) = M(T,n-1)M(R^{n-1}(T),1).$$

If $R^n(T) = \lambda^{(n)}$, we have

$$\lambda = \frac{M(T,n)\lambda^{(n)}}{|M(T,n)\lambda^{(n)}|}$$

Given a matrix M, we write

$$M\Delta = M\mathbb{R}^+_d \cap \Delta_d = \left\{ \frac{Mv}{|Mv|} : v \in \Delta_d \right\}.$$

Lemma 2.2. *Let $T = T_{\lambda,\pi}$, $S = S_{\eta,\pi}$ be IETs. If $\eta \in M(T,k)\Delta$, then*

$$M(S,k) = M(T,k).$$

That is, the IETs T and S have the same first k steps of Rauzy induction.

We will be working with the Rauzy class of the permutation (4321) on 4 letters. We record the graph (Figure 1) and the associated matrices (Figure 2).

3. Abstract Setup

Proposition 3.1. *Let $S_1 \supset S_2 \supset \ldots$ be a nested sequence of finite unions of disjoint affine 3-simplices (in $\mathbb{R}^4$ or Δ_3) so that*

1. *There exists a constant $c > 0$ so that any simplex in S_k has 1 side of length at least c.*
2. *There exists a constant $\rho > 0$ and a quadratic polynomial $p(k)$ with leading coefficient $a > 0$ so that each simplex in S_k contains $\rho 10^{p(k)}$ simplices in S_{k+1}.*
3. *There exists $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $h(x)$, a cubic polynomial with leading coefficient $-b$ where $b > 0$, so that $z < 10^{h(k)}$ and $p \in \mathbb{R}^4$ (or Δ_3) then $B(p,z)$ intersects at most one simplex in S_k, J so that $B(p,z) \cap S_{k+r} = B(p,z) \cap J \cap S_{k+r}$.*

Then $H_{dim}(\cap S_i) \geq 1 + \frac{a}{3b}$. In particular if $a = 12$ and $b = \frac{8}{3}$ then $H_{dim}(\cap S_i) \geq \frac{5}{2}$.

To prove Proposition 3.1 we use Frostman's lemma:

Theorem 3.2. *(Frostman's Lemma) Let A be a Borel set, $s > 0$, and μ be a measure on A such that*

$$\mu(B(x,r)) \leq Cr^s.$$

Then

$$\text{Hdim}(A) \geq s.$$

Proof of Proposition 3.1. First we build a sequence of measures on the S_k whose weak-* limits will have that $\cap_{k=1}^{\infty} S_k$ is a set of full measure. Let μ_1 be defined to be the probability measure so that:

(1) It gives equal mass to each element of S_1.
(2) It is a scalar multiple of Lebesgue when restricted to any element of S_1.

Given μ_{k-1} which is a probability measure which restricted to each S_{k-1} is a scalar multiple of Lebesgue, we inductively define μ_k to be the probability measure so that on each element of S_k it is a scalar multiple of Lebesgue satisfying the following: if $J, J' \subset I \in S_{k-1}$ then $\mu_k(J) = \mu_k(J')$. That is, we evenly divide the mass in I to its descendants in S_k. Let μ_∞ be a weak-* limit of these measures (it is unique but this is not important for our purposes).

Lemma 3.3. *If $J \in S_k$ then $\mu_k(J) = \mu_L(J)$ for all $L \geq k$.*

Proof. We prove this by induction. It is clear when $L = k$. We now assume that it is true for $L = r \geq k$. Observe first that $\mu_{r+1}(J) \geq \mu_r(J)$ because

$$\mu_{r+1}(J) \geq \sum_{J \in S_{r+1} \cap J} \mu_{r+1}(J).$$

By construction of μ_{r+1}

$$\sum_{J \in S_{r+1} \cap J} \mu_{r+1}(J) = \mu_r(J).$$

By disjointness of J from the other elements of S_k we have

$$\mu_L(J) \leq \mu_k(J)$$

for all $L \geq k$. □

Lemma 3.4. *For all $k \leq L$ we have that if $J, J' \in S_k$ then $\mu_L(J) = \mu_L(J')$.*

Proof. This follows by induction and the fact that $|S_{k+1} \cap J| = \rho 10^{p(k)}$ for all $J \in S_k$. □

Lemma 3.5.

$$\mu_L(B(x,r)) \leq \frac{|\{J \in S_L : B(x,r) \cap J \neq \emptyset\}|}{|S_L|} g \frac{r}{c}$$

where g depends only on dimension.

Proof. If $J \in S_k$ consider slices of J by parallel hyperplanes perpendicular to the long side of J. There exists a constant e so that for a segment of the long side of length $\frac{c}{e}$ we have that the hyperplanes intersect J in area at least $\frac{1}{2}$ of the maximal area of such a hyperplane. Let $g = 2e$. □

Corollary 3.6. Let $B(x,r) \cap S_{k+L} \subset J \in S_k$. Then

$$\mu_\infty(B(x,r)) \leq g \frac{r}{c} |S_k|^{-1} = g \frac{r}{c} (\prod_{i=1}^{k} (\rho 10^{p(k)}))^{-1}.$$

A simple calculation shows that if P a cubic polynomial with leading term $-\frac{a}{3}$, then for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a C so that

$$10^{P(x)} < C(10^{h(k+1)})^{\frac{a}{3b} - \epsilon}. \tag{3.1}$$

We now complete the proof. For each r let $k_r = \min\{L : r > 10^{h(L)}\}$. By the previous corollary $\mu_\infty(B(x,r)) \leq \frac{r}{c}|S_{k_r}|$. By Condition (2) this is at most

$$\frac{r}{c}\rho^{k_r-1}10^{-\sum_{i=1}^{k_r-1}p(i)} = \frac{r}{c}\rho^k 10^{-P(k_r)}$$

where $P(x)$ is a cubic polynomial with leading coefficient $\frac{a}{3}$. It follows by our observation (3.1) above that for every ϵ there exists C so that

$$\mu(B(x,r)) < \frac{r}{c}C(10^{h(k_r-1)})^{\frac{a}{3b}-\epsilon} \leq \frac{1}{c}Cr^{1+\frac{a}{3b}-\epsilon}.$$

□

Lemma 3.7. *To verify Condition 3 of Propostion 3.1 it suffices to show that there exists g a cubic polynomial with leading coefficient $-b$ so that the elements of S_{k+2} avoid an $10^{g(k)}$ neighborhood of the boundary of S_k.*

Proof. Let $h(k) = g(k)$. If $z < 10^{h(k)}$ and $B(p,z)$ intersects two elements of S_k and so is in a $g(k)$ neighborhood of the boundary of an element of S_k. So $B(p,z) \cap S_{k+2} = \emptyset$. Condition 3 follows with $r = 2$. □

4. The paths we take

Rauzy induction provides a criterion (due to Veech) for non-unique ergodicity that is crucial for our construction.

Lemma 4.1. [16, §1 and Proposition 3.22] *Let T be an IET so that $R^k(T)$ is defined for all T. If T has exactly r ergodic probability measures then*

$$\Delta_\infty(T) := \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} M(T,k)\Delta$$

is a subsimplex of dimension $r-1$. Every point in it gives an IET with r ergodic probability measures, which are in bijective correspondence with the set of invariant measures of T.

We will use this criterion to build a large set of IETs T with at least 2 invariant measures. For this, we need to consider some very specific paths. First, define the matrix $L_1(k)$ by going from (4321) to (4132) to (4213) and back to (4321) n times. We have

$$L_1(n) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ n & n & n & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Similarly, define the matrix $U_1(n)$ by going from (4321) to (4132) to (4213) then looping at (4213) for k times and then going back to (4321). We have

$$U_1(n) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & n+1 & n \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Given $A \in SL_2(\mathbb{Z}_+)$, we can write

$$A = H_1^{p_1}H_2^{p_2}H_1^{p_3} \cdot \ldots \cdot H_1^{p_k} \tag{4.1}$$

for nonnegative integers $p_1, \dots, p_r$ and where

$$H_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } H_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Notice the interactions of the 3rd and 4th columns under $L_1(n)$ and $U_1(n)$ are H_1^n and $H_2^n H_1$ respectively. This motivates the defintion

$$N_1(A, r) = L_1^{p_1} U_1^{p_2} L_1^{p_3 - 1} U_1^{p_4} \dots L_1^{p_k - 1} U_1^r.$$

Similarly we define $L_2(n), U_2(n)$ and $N_2(A, r)$ on the left hand side of the Rauzy graph. We will be especially concerned with A and r satisfying

$$|A| \in I_k := \left[10^{k^2-k}, 2 \cdot 10^{k^2-k}\right] \text{ and } r \in J_k := \left[10^{(k+1)^2+k}, 2 \cdot 10^{(k+1)^2+k}\right].$$

4.1. **Properties.** We consider matrices M_k of the form

$$\begin{aligned} M_k &= M_k\left(\{A_i\}_{i=1}^{2k+2}, \{r_i\}_{i=1}^{2k+3}\right) \\ &= N_1(A_3, r_4) N_2(A_4, r_5) \dots N_1(A_{2i+1}, r_{2i+2}) N_2(A_{2i+2}, r_{2i+3}) \dots N_1(A_{2k+1}, r_{2k+2}) N_2(A_{2k+2}, r_{2k+3}) \end{aligned}$$

where $|A_i| \in I_i$ and $r_i \in J_i$. Given a matrix M, let $C_j(M)$ denote the j^{th} column, $|C_j(M)|$ denote the sum of the entries in the i^{th} column, and $C_{max}(M)$ denote the column with the largest sum of entries.

Notation Recall that given a metric d on a space X, we can define a pseudo-metric on subsets of X via $d(A, B) = \inf\{d(a, b); a \in A, b \in B\}$. We will use this where d is the metric on the simplex Δ induced by angles between vectors. If v, w are vectors let $\text{span}_\Delta(v, w) = \{av + bw : a, b \geq 0\} \cap \Delta$. In general this can be empty but if $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^4_+$ it will not be. In the section below will view columns of matrices as elements of the simplex.

4.2. **What we will show.** In this section we will prove that if M_k has the form given above where the A_i are all D-balanced ($D > 9$) for all $i \leq 2k + 2$ then there exists f, a cubic polynomial with leading coefficient $-\frac{8}{3}$, quadratic polynomials p, q and a cubic polynomial H with leading coefficient 4 so that

(1) $d\left(C_i(M_k), C_j(M_K)\right) > \frac{1}{900}$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $j \in \{3, 4\}$ (Proposition 4.8).
(2) $d\left(C_1(M_k), C_2(M_K)\right), d\left(C_3(M_k), C_4(M_k)\right) \in [10^{p(k)} 10^{f(k)}, 10^{q(k)} 10^{f(k)}]$(Proposition 4.3).
(3) There are at least $\rho^k H(k)$ such M_k(§4.5).

Note the connection between Conclusion 1 and Conclusion 1 of the Proposition 3.1. Similarly for Conclusion 3 and Conclusion 2 of the Proposition 3.1.

4.3. **Angle bounds.**

Lemma 4.2. *If M_k is a matrix described above, then*

$$|C_j(M_q)| \in \left[\prod_{i=4}^{2k+3} 10^{i^2}, 2^{2k} \cdot 2 \prod_{i=4}^{2k+3} 10^{i^2}\right] \text{ for } j = 1, 2$$

and

$$|C_j(M_q)| \in \left[\prod_{i=3}^{2k+2} 10^{i^2}, 2^{2k} \cdot 2 \prod_{i=3}^{2k+2} 10^{i^2}\right] \text{ for } j = 3, 4.$$

Proof. We have

$$|C_j(MN_1(A,r))| \leq |C_j(M)| \cdot |A| \max\{|C_3(M)|, |C_4(M)|\}$$

for $j = 1, 2$. Similarly,

$$|C_i(MN_1(A,r))| \geq |A| r \min\{|C_3(M)|, |C_4(M)|\}$$

for $j = 3, 4$. Similar inequalities hold for N_2. The lemma follows by induction with the extra factor of 2 absorbing N_1's contribution to C_1, C_2 or N_2's contribution to C_3, C_4. □

The remainder of this subsection is devoted to proving:

Proposition 4.3. *Let M_k be as given in Equation 4.2 where all of the A_i are D-balanced. There exists a cubic polynomial f with leading coefficient $-\frac{8}{3}$ and two quadratic polynomials p, q so that $d\left(C_1(M_k), C_2(M_K)\right)$ and $d\left(C_3(M_k), C_4(M_k)\right)$ are in $[10^{p(k)}10^{f(k)}, 10^{q(k)}10^{f(k)}]$.*

We present an elementary lemma on how the angle between vectors changes under addition.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and let θ_0 denote the angle between v and w. If θ_1 denotes the angle between $v + w$ and w, we have*

$$|\sin\theta_1| = \frac{\|v\|}{\|v+w\|}|\sin\theta_0|.$$

In particular, if v and w are perpendicular, we have

$$|\sin\theta_1| = \frac{\|v\|}{\|v+w\|}.$$

Proof. If v and w are linearly dependent then both sides are zero. If not, let w' denote the vector w rotated by $\pi/2$ in the plane spanned by v, w. Then

$$|\sin\theta_0| = \frac{|\langle v, w'\rangle|}{\|v\|\|w\|},$$

and

$$|\sin\theta_1| = \frac{|\langle v+w, w'\rangle|}{\|v+w\|\|w\|} = \frac{|\langle v, w'\rangle|}{\|v+w\|\|w\|},$$

proving the result. □

Lemma 4.5. *Let $D > 1$, and suppose $A = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in SL_2(\mathbb{Z}_+)$ is D-balanced, that is,*

$$\frac{1}{D} \leq \frac{\left|\begin{pmatrix} a \\ c \end{pmatrix}\right|}{\left|\begin{pmatrix} b \\ d \end{pmatrix}\right|} \leq D.$$

Then if θ is the angle between $\begin{pmatrix} a \\ c \end{pmatrix}$ and $\begin{pmatrix} b \\ d \end{pmatrix}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{D'|A|^2} < |\theta| < \frac{D'}{|A|^2}.$$

D' depends quadratically on D.

Proof. We have

$$\sin\theta = \frac{ad-bc}{\left\|\begin{pmatrix} a \\ c \end{pmatrix}\right\|\left\|\begin{pmatrix} b \\ d \end{pmatrix}\right\|} = \frac{1}{\left\|\begin{pmatrix} a \\ c \end{pmatrix}\right\|\left\|\begin{pmatrix} b \\ d \end{pmatrix}\right\|}.$$

By the balancedness condition $\left\|\begin{pmatrix} a \\ c \end{pmatrix}\right\|, \left\|\begin{pmatrix} b \\ d \end{pmatrix}\right\|, |A|$ are all comparable up to a factor of D and a universal factor $(\sqrt{2})$ from comparison of the L^1 and L^2 norms on $\mathbb{R}^2$. The other factor going into D' is the Lipschitz constant of the arcsin function on $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$. □

Lemma 4.6. *Let $A \in SL_2(\mathbb{Z}_+)$ be a D-balanced matrix. Then there exists a constant D' depending only on D such that*

$$\frac{d(C_3(M), C_4(M))}{D'|A|^2 r} \leq d\left(C_3(MN_1(A, 2r)), C_4(MN_1(A, r))\right) \leq D' \frac{d(C_3(M), C_4(M))}{|A|^2 r}.$$

Proof. By the two previous lemmas there exists D'' depending only on D such that

$$\frac{d(C_3(M), C_4(M))}{D''|A|^2} \leq d\left(C_3(MN_1(A, 0)), C_4(MN_1(A, 0))\right) \leq D'' \frac{d(C_3(M), C_4(M))}{|A|^2}.$$

Notice that, for $J, K \geq 0$

$$C_3(MN_1(A, K)) = (K+1)C_3(MN_1(A, 0)) + C_4(MN_1(A, 0))$$

and

$$C_4(MN_1(A, K)) = KC_3(MN_1(A, 0)) + C_4(MN_1(A, 0)).$$

So

$$C_3(MN_1(A, J)) = C_4(MN_1(A, J)) + (J+1)C_3(MN(A, 0)).$$

The lemma follows by Lemma 4.4. □

Lemma 4.7. *Let $A \subset SL_2(\mathbb{Z}_+)$ be D-balanced. Then there exists D' depending only on D such that*

$$\frac{d(C_1(M), C_2(M))}{D'|A|^2 r^2} \leq d\left(C_1(MN_2(A, r)), C_2(MN_2(A, r))\right) \leq D' \frac{d(C_1(M), C_2(M))}{|A|^2 r^2}.$$

This is similar to the proof of Lemma 4.6.

Proof of Proposition 4.3. This follows from the previous two lemmas and induction. Indeed, let M_k and $M_{k+1} = M_k N_1(A_{2k+3}, r_{2_k+4})N_2(A_{2k+4}, r_{2k+4})$ satisfy our assumptions. By Lemma 4.7

$$\frac{1}{4D'} 10^{-((2k+4)^2+(2k+5)^2)} < d(C_3(M_{k+1}), C_4(M_{k+1})) < 4D' 10^{-((2k+4)^2+(2k+5)^2)}.$$

The leading term in the exponent is $-8k^2$. Summing these terms as k varies gives a polynomial with leading term $-\frac{8}{3}k^3$. We choose the quadratic polynomials $p(k)$ and $q(k)$ to absorb the possible lower order terms and factors of D' and 2.

The argument for C_1, C_2 is similar. □

4.4. **Non-unique ergodicity.**

Proposition 4.8. *Under our assumptions on A_i and r_i,*

$$\bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} M_k\Delta$$

is a non-degenerate line segment with length at least $\frac{1}{900}$.

Let

$$U_k = \text{span}_\Delta \left\{C_1\left(M_k\right), C_2\left(N_1(A_{2i+1}, r_{2i+2})N_2(A_{2i+2}, r_{2i+3})\right)\right\}$$

and

$$V_k = \text{span}_\Delta \left\{C_1\left(M_k\right), C_2\left(N_1(A_{2i+1}, r_{2i+2})N_2(A_{2i+2}, r_{2i+3})\right)\right\}.$$

Lemma 4.9. $d(U_1, V_1) > \frac{1}{10}$.

Proof. Observe that if

$$u \in \text{span}_\Delta\{C_1(N_1(A, r), C_2(N_1(A, r))\}$$

then the sum of the first and second coordinates of u

$$u_1 + u_2 = 1.$$

If

$$v \in \text{span}_\Delta\{C_3(N_1(A, r), C_4(N_1(A, r))\}$$

then the first and second coordinates satisfy

$$v_1 = v_2 = 0.$$

Since

$$\max\{|C_i(N_1(A, r)|\}_{i=1,2} \leq 2$$

it follows that

$$d\left(\text{span}_\Delta\{C_1(N_1(A, r), C_2(N_1(A, r))\}, \text{span}_\Delta\{C_3(N_1(A, r), C_4(N_1(A, r))\}\right) \geq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}.$$

We have

$$\text{span}_\Delta \left\{C_1\left(N_1(A, r)N_2(A', r')\right), C_2\left(N_1(A, r)N_2(A', r')\right)\right\} \subset \text{span}_\Delta\{C_1(N_1(A, r)), C_2(N_1(A, r)))\}.$$

Moreover, if

$$v \in \text{span}_\Delta\{C_3(N_1(A, r)N_2(A', r')), C_4(N_1(A, r)N_2(A', r'))\}$$

then $v = v' + u$ where

$$|u| \leq \max_{i=1,2} C_i(N_1(A, r)N_2(A', 0))| \leq 2 \cdot 2 \cdot 10^{4-2}$$

and

$$|v| \geq \min_{i=3,4} |C_i(N_1(A, r))| \geq 10^4 \text{ and } v \in \text{span}_\Delta\{C_3(N_1(A, r), C_4(N_1(A, r))\}.$$

To see the condition on u observe that the loop at (3241) and arrow from (3241) to (4321) does not add anything to the columns that will be C_3 and C_4 at (4321). By Lemma 4.4

$$\max\{d(y, \text{span}_\Delta\{C_3(N_1(A, r), C_4(N_1(A, r))\}) : y \in \text{span}_\Delta\{C_3(N_1(A, r), C_4(N_1(A, r))\}\} \leq \frac{1}{10}.$$

□

Lemma 4.10. $d(U_{k+1}, V_{k+1}) > d(U_k, V_k) - 2 \cdot \frac{2^{2k}}{10^{2k}}$.

Proof. By a similar argument to the second paragraph of the previous lemma

$$\max\{d(y, U_{k+1}) : y \in U_k\} \leq \frac{\max_{i=3,4}|C_i\left(M_{k-1}N_1(A_{2i+3}, r_{2i+4})N_2(A_{2i+4}, 0)\right)|}{\min_{i=1,2}|C_i\left(N_1(A_{2i+1}, r_{2i+2})N_2(A_{2i+2}, r_{2i+3}))N_1(A_{2i+3}, r_{2i+4})\right)|} \leq \frac{2^{2k}}{10^{2k}}. \tag{4.2}$$

The last inequality uses Lemma 4.2. Similarly

$$\max\{d(y, V_{k+1}) : y \in V_k\} \leq \frac{2^{2k}}{10^{2k}}.$$

Because

$$d(U_{k+1}, V_{k+1}) \geq d(U_k, V_k) - (\max\{d(y, U_{k+1}) : y \in U_k\} + \max\{d(y, V_{k+1}) : y \in V_k\})$$

the lemma follows. □

Proof of Proposition 4.8. It is straightforward that the length of $\cap_{k=1}^{\infty} M_k\Delta$ is at least $\lim_{k\to\infty} d(U_k, V_k)$. By the previous two lemmas this is at least

$$\frac{1}{10} - 2\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{2^{2k}}{10^{2k}} > \frac{1}{900}.$$

□

4.5. **Number of described matrices.**

Proposition 4.11. *There exists a cubic polynomial H with leading coefficient 4 and a constant ρ so that there are at least ρ^k matrices M_k satisfying conditions 1 and 2 of Section 4.2.*

Lemma 4.12. *There exists $D > 0$ and a polynomial e of degree 2 and and leading coefficient 6 so that set of D-balanced matrices $N_i(A, L)$ with $|A| \in I_{2j+i}$ and D balanced and $L \in J_{2j+i+1}$ is $10^{e(j)}$.*

Proof. First observe that there exists $c > 0$ so that the number of choices for A is at least $c(10^{(2j)^2-2j})^2$. This follows because there number of positive matrices in $SL_2(\mathbb{Z}_+$ with norm between R and $2R$ is proportional to R^2 and if $M \in SL_2(\mathbb{Z}^+)$ then $M\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ is 2-balanced. The lemma follows because there are at least $10^{(2j)^j+j}$ choices for L. □

Proof of Proposition 4.11. By applying the previous lemma to N_1 and N_2 we observe that there is quadratic polynomial $\tilde{e}$ with leading coefficient 12 so that for each matrix

$$\begin{aligned} M_k &= M_k\left(\{A_i\}_{i=1}^{2k+2}, \{r_i\}_{i=1}^{2k+3}\right) \\ &= N_1(A_3, r_4)N_2(A_4, r_5)\dots N_1(A_{2i+1}, r_{2i+2})N_2(A_{2i+2}, r_{2i+3})\dots N_1(A_{2k+1}, r_{2k+2})N_2(A_{2k+2}, r_{2k+3}) \end{aligned}$$

where the $|A_i| \in I_i$ and D balanced and $r_i \in J_i$ there are at least $10^{\tilde{e}(k+1)}$ choices of M_{k+1}. So the total choices of M_k is at least $\prod_{j=1}^{k} 10^{\tilde{e}(k)}$ which is greater than $10^{H(k)}$ for some cubic polynomial H with leading coefficient 4. By the previous sections matrices of these forms satisfy conditions 1 and 2 of Section 4.2. □

5. Verifying the assumptions of Proposition 3.1

We consider the simplices given in the previous section. They are in the 3-dimensional simplex, and are parallelapipeds. They have 4 long sides connecting C_i and C_j for $i \in \{1,2\}$ and $j \in \{3,4\}$. There are two short sides connecting C_1, C_2 and C_3, C_4.

They satisfy the conditions of Proposition 3.1 except Condition 3.

When $k = 5$ we insert some additional conditions, in order to achieve the separation we require, which geometrically can be thought of as 'chopping off the ends' of the long sides of the parallelapiped.

(1) We delete a 10^{-5} neighborhood of $\text{span}_\Delta(C_1(M_5), C_2(M_5))$ and $\text{span}_\Delta(C_3(M_5), C_4(M_5))$.
(2) Inductively for each $k \geq 5$ consider $M_k N_1(A_{2k+3}, r_{2k+4}) N_2(A_{2k+4}, r_{2k+5})$ given as in the previous section. We remove all of these simplices that contain the two A_{2k+3} closest to the end points of $\text{span}_\Delta(C_(M_k), C_2(M_k))$ and the two A_{2k+4} closest to the end points of $\text{span}_\Delta(C_3(M_k), C_4(M_k))$.

Call the sets remaining after these deletions S_k. We claim that this sequence of sets satisfies Condition 3 for all $k \geq 5$.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $k \geq 5$. Let $M \in S_k$ and $M' = MN_1(A_{2k+3}, r_{2k+4})N_2(A_{2k+4}, r_{2k+5})$*

$$d\left(M'\Delta \cap S_{k+1}, \partial M\Delta\right) \geq \frac{1}{10^7} \max\{d\left(span_\Delta(C_1(M'), C_2(M')), \{C_1(M), C_2(M)\}\right), \\ d\left(span_\Delta(C_3(M'), C_4(M')), \{C_3(M), C_4(M)\}\right)\}. \tag{5.1}$$

Here, we are measuring the separation of the line segments

$$\text{span}_\Delta(C_i(M'), C_{i+1}(M')), i = 1, 3$$

from the set of endpoints $\{C_i(M), C_{i+1}(M)\}$ of the previous line segments.

Proof. This follows because we delete the neighborhood of the two sides, the simplices are convex combinations and Lemma 4.10. □

Lemma 5.2. *S_k satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 3.7.*

Proof. By the previous lemma it suffices to bound

$$\frac{1}{10^7} \max\{d(\text{span}_\Delta(C_1(M'), C_2(M')), \{C_1(M), C_2(M)\}, d(\text{span}_\Delta(C_3(M'), C_4(M')), \{C_3(M), C_4(M)\})\}.$$

By our choice of deleting two A_{2k+3} closest to the end points of $\text{span}_\Delta(C_1(M_k), C_2(M_k))$ and Lemma 4.7 we have that

$$d(\text{span}_\Delta(C_1(M'), C_2(M')), \{C_1(M), C_2(M)\} \geq d(C_1(M), C_2(M)) \frac{1}{D'|A_{2k+4}|^2}.$$

□

Thus, we may invoke Proposition 3.1 have shown the *lower bound*:

Corollary 5.3. The set of non-uniquely ergodic 4-IETs NUE(4321) $\subset \Delta$ satisfies

$$\text{Hdim}(\text{NUE}(4321)) \geq \frac{5}{2}.$$

6. Bounds for Hausdorff dimension

6.1. **Technical Lemmas.** Before we prove the upper bound for Hausdorff dimension, we require some technical lemmas:

6.1.1. *Lines and measures.* In this subsection, we collect some technical lemmas on lines and measures in Δ and $\mathcal{H}(2)$. First, we state a proposition relating Masur-Veech measure on the stratum $\mathcal{H}(2)$ to the measure class on the *set of line segments* in the simplex Δ_4, which we view as $\Delta_4 \times \mathbb{R}^4$, and endow it with the Lebesgue measure class $m_\ell = m_\Delta \times m$, where m_Δ is the Lebesgue measure class on Δ_4, and m is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^4$.

Recall from §2 we have the map $\mathcal{T} : \mathcal{H}(2) \to \Delta_4$, associating the normalized return map to the transversal to the vertical flow on ω. Let $U \subset \mathcal{H}(2)$, and consider the set of lines

$$L(U) = \{\{\mathcal{T}(h_s\omega)\}_{s\in[0,\epsilon]} : \omega \in U, \epsilon > 0\}$$

in Δ_4 associated to horocycle trajectories based in U. Let μ_{MV} denote Masur-Veech measure on the stratum $\mathcal{H}(2)$. It has been a long standing problem to understand the image of L, that is, to understand the set of line segments in Δ_4 which arise as projections of horocycle trajectories. This problem was solved in full generality by Minsky-Weiss [13, §5], who showed [13, Theorem 5.3], that given $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \in \Delta_4 \times \mathbb{R}^4$, the line segment defined by

$$\{\mathbf{a} + s\mathbf{b} : s \in [0, 1]\}$$

is in the image of L if and only if a certain quadratic form Q evaluated at $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}$ is positive, and thus there is an open set of such pairs. Moreover, they show that for each pair

$$(\mathbf{a_0}, \mathbf{b_0}) \text{ with } Q(\mathbf{a_0}, \mathbf{b_0}) > 0,$$

there is an open neighborhood U' of $(\mathbf{a_0}, \mathbf{b_0})$ and a local *affine* inverse map to the map L. Thus, we have:

Proposition 6.1. *Let $U \subset \mathcal{H}(2)$ be such that $L(U)$ is open. Suppose $A \subset L(U)$ with $m_\ell(A) > 0$. Then $\mu_{MV}(L^{-1}(A)) > 0$. In particular, if $\mu_{MV}(U) > 0$, then $m_\ell(L(U)) > 0$.*

Second, we require the following:

Lemma 6.2. *If $U \subset \Delta_4 \times \mathbb{R}^4$ is an open set in the space of lines then there exists V an open subset of Δ_4 and an open set of directions $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ so that for every $\theta \in \Theta$ and $v \in V$ the line*

$$L(v, \theta) := \{v + t\theta : t \in (0, 1)\}$$

in direction θ through v is in U.

Proof. Let Θ be a set of directions so that $\bar{\Theta}$ is compact and for every $\theta \in \bar{\Theta}$ we have $L(v, \theta) \in U$. For each $\theta \in \bar{\Theta}$ there exists $\epsilon_\theta > 0$ so that $d(w, v) < \epsilon_\theta$ we have $L(w, \theta) \in U$. By compactness there exists $\epsilon > 0$ so for all $\theta \in \bar{\Theta}$ and w with $d(w, v) < \epsilon$ we have $L(w, \theta) \in U$. Let $V = B(v, \epsilon)$. □

6.1.2. *Metric Geometry.* We also require some more general technical lemmas on Hausdorff dimension: Let $\mathcal{H}^t$ be the $t-$dimensional Hausdorff measure. Let C_t be the Riesz t-capacity (see [11, Definition 8.4] for the definition). Let $Gras(n, n-m)$ denote the Grasmannian on $n-m$ planes in n space. Let $\gamma_{n,n-m}$ denote the natural measure class on $Gras(n, n-m)$. If $W \in Gras(n, n-m)$ and $a \in W^\perp$ let W_a be the translate of W by a.

Theorem 6.3. *(*[11, Theorem 10.8]*) Let $m \leq t \leq n$ and $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $C_t(A) > 0$ then for $\gamma_{n,n-m}$ almost every $W \in Grass(n, n-m)$*

$$\mathcal{H}^m(\{a \in W^\perp : C_{t-m}(A \cap W_a) > 0\}).$$

By [11, Theorem 8.9 (3)], for Borel sets, capacity dimension and Hausdorff dimension are the same so we obtain the following corollary:

Corollary 6.4. If $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $\text{Hdim}(A) \geq t > n-1$ a positive measure set of lines in $\mathbb{R}^n$ intersect A in a set with Hausdorff dimension at least t.

Lemma 6.5. *Let V be a non-empty open subset of Δ_4 and assume that the Hausdorff dimension of the set* NUE(4321) *of not uniquely ergodic 4-IETs is at least $3-c$ as a subset of Δ_4. Then*

$$\text{Hdim}(\text{NUE}(4321) \cap V) \geq 3 - c.$$

Proof. There exists a matrix of Rauzy induction M so that $M\Delta \subset V$ (pick a matrix so that the subsimplex $M\Delta$ is contained in a ball inside V). Being non-uniquely ergodic is Rauzy induction invariant so $M(\text{NUE}(4321)) \subset \text{NUE}(4321)$. M is a bilipshitz map. (Note that the various M are not uniformly bilipshitz but each individual one is bilipshitz.) Sincee $M(\text{NUE}(4321)) \subset (\text{NUE}(4321) \cap V)$, we have

$$\text{Hdim}(\text{NUE}(4321) \cap V) \geq \text{Hdim}(M(\text{NUE}(4321))) = \text{Hdim}(\text{NUE}(4321)) \geq 3 - c.$$

□

6.2. **Upper Bound.** In this section we prove:

Theorem 6.6. *The set of minimal and not uniquely ergodic 4-IETs* NUE(4321) $\subset \Delta_4$ *has Hausdorff dimension at most $\frac{5}{2}$,*

$$\text{Hdim}(\text{NUE}(4321)) \leq \frac{5}{2}.$$

This result and Corollary 5.3 establishes Theorem 1.4. We first note:

Proposition 6.7. *Let $c < 1$ and suppose $h = \text{Hdim}(\text{NUE}(4321)) > 3 - c$. Then for μ_{MV} almost every abelian differential ω,*

$$\text{Hdim}(\text{NUE}(\omega)) \geq 1 - c.$$

Proof of Proposition 6.7. Let U be an open set in the space of lines given by Minsky-Weiss [13, Theorem 5.3]. Let Θ and V be given by Lemma 6.2. By Theorem 6.3 and Lemma 6.5 almost every element of $\{(v : \theta) : v \in V, \theta \in \Theta\}$ has a translate that intersects $V \cap NUE$ in Hausdorff dimension at least $1 - c$. By our assumption (Lemma 6.2) these lines are in U. The set of flat surfaces they come from has positive μ_{MV} measure. By $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$-invariance of Hausdorff dimension of non-uniquely ergodic directions and the ergodicity of μ_{MV} with respect to the $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ action, this set must have full measure. □

Recall Masur's upper bound:

Theorem 6.8. [9, Main Theorem] *For every abelian differential ω, the Hausdorff dimension of the set of not uniquely ergodic directions is at most $\frac{1}{2}$.*

Proof of Theorem 6.6. By Masur's upper bound,

$$\mathrm{Hdim}(\mathrm{NUE}(\omega)) \leq 1/2,$$

and thus, by Proposition 6.7, $h \leq 5/2$. □

6.3. **Corollaries.** Finally, we prove Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.1 using Theorem 1.4. The key result is the fundamental property of Hausdorff dimension:

$$\mathrm{Hdim}(X \times Y) \geq \mathrm{Hdim}(X) + \mathrm{Hdim}(Y).$$

6.3.1. *Proof of Theorem 1.2.* $\mathcal{H}(2)$ is a fiber bundle over Δ_4 via the map $\mathcal{T}$, and the vertical foliation of ω is non-uniquely ergodic if and only if $\mathcal{T}(\omega)$ is a non-uniquely ergodic IET. The fibers of $\mathcal{T}$ are 4-dimensional (and in fact $\mathcal{T}$) defines a local product structure on $\mathcal{H}$. Thus we have the Hausdorff dimension of the set of ω with a non-uniquely ergodic vertical foliation is given by

$$4 + \frac{5}{2} = 7 - \frac{1}{2}$$

as claimed. □

6.3.2. *Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Combining Theorem 6.8 for the upper bound and Corollary 5.3 with Proposition 6.7 for the lower bound, we have that the set of flat surfaces ω satisfying

$$\mathrm{Hdim}(\mathrm{NUE}(\omega)) = \frac{1}{2}$$

has positive μ_{MV}-measure. By μ_{MV}-ergodicity of $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$, it must have full μ_{MV}-measure. A similar argument using only the upper bound yields Theorem 1.6.

References

[1] Y. Cheung *Hausdorff dimension of the set of nonergodic directions. With an appendix by M. Boshernitzan.* Ann. of Math. (2) 158 (2003), no. 2, 661-678.

[2] Y. Cheung, P. Hubert and H. Masur, *Dichotomy for the Hausdorff dimension of the set of nonergodic directions.* Invent. Math. 183 (2011), no. 2, 337-383.

[3] M. Keane, *Interval Exchange Trasformations*, Mathematische Zeitschrift, v. 141, 25-31, 1975.

[4] M. Keane, *Non-ergodic interval exchange transformations* Israel J. Math. 26 (1977), no. 2, 188-196.

[5] S. Kerckhoff, H. Masur and J. Smillie, *Ergodicity of billiard flows and quadratic differentials.* Ann. of Math. (2) 124 (1986), no. 2, 293-311.

[6] H. B. Keynes and D. Newton, *A Minimal, Non-Uniquely Ergodic Interval Exchange Transformation*, Math. Z. 148 (1976) 101-105.

[7] M. Kontsevich and A. Zorich, *Connected components of the moduli spaces of Abelian differentials with prescribed singularities*, Invent. Math. v. 153 (2003), no. 3, 631-678.

[8] H. Masur, *Interval exchange transformations and measured foliations*, Annals of Mathematics, v. 115, 169-200, 1982.

[9] H. Masur, *Hausdorff dimension of the set of nonergodic foliations of a quadratic differential*, Duke Math. J., v. 66, 387-442, 1992.

[10] H. Masur and J. Smillie, *Hausdorff Dimension of Sets of Nonergodic Measured Foliations*, Annals of Mathematics, Second Series, Vol. 134, No. 3 (Nov., 1991), pp. 455-543.

[11] P. Mattila *Geometry of sets and measures in Euclidean spaces. Fractals and rectifiability.* Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 44. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995. xii+343

[12] Y. Minsky, and B. Weiss, *Non-divergence of horocyclic flows on moduli space*, J. Reine Angew. Math. v. 552, 131-177, 2002.

[13] Y. Minsky, and B. Weiss, *Cohomology classes represented by measured foliations, and Mahler's question for interval exchanges*, to appear, Annales scientifiques de l'ENS.

[14] E. A. Sataev, *The number of invariant measures for flows on orientable surfaces* Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. 39 (1975), no. 4, 860-878.

[15] W. Veech, *A Kronecker-Weyl theorem modulo 2.* Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 60 1968 1163-1164.

[16] W. Veech, *Interval exchange transformations.* J. Analyse Math. 33 (1978), 222-272.
[17] W. Veech, *Gauss measures for transformations on the space of interval exchange maps*, Annals of Mathematics, v. 115, 201-242, 1982.
[18] J.-C. Yoccoz, *Continued Fraction Algorithms for Interval Exchange Maps: an Introduction*, in "Frontiers in Number Theory, Geometry and Physics", proceedings of the Spring School at Les Houches, France, March 2003
[19] A. Zorich, *Flat surfaces*, Frontiers in number theory, physics, and geometry. I, 437-583, Springer, Berlin, 2006.

E-mail address: jathreya@illinois.edu

E-mail address: chaika@math.utah.edu

Department of Mathematics, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, 1409 W. Green Street, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

Department of Mathematics, University of Utah, 155 S 1400 E Room 233, Salt Lake City, UT 84112